DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 084 HE 022 104

AUTHOR Woodard, Dudley B., Jr.; And Others
TITLE Student Outcomes Assessment Survey 1987-88. ASHE 1988 Annual Meeting Paper.
INSTITUTION National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc.
PUB DATE Nov 88
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (St. Louis, MO, November 3-6, 1988). For related document, see ED 294 487.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; *Educational Assessment; Educational Policy; Higher Education; Institutional Role; National Surveys; Organizational Objectives; *Outcomes of Education; Questionnaires; *School Effectiveness; State Programs; Student Development; *Student Evaluation; Success
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; *College Outcomes Assessment

ABSTRACT

The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) conducted a national survey to determine the status of local campus initiatives in student outcomes assessment. Its goal was to determine whether assessment programs have been or are being developed, the objectives and source of initiation, and assessment techniques. Of particular interest was the role student affairs played in local initiatives. All U.S. and Canadian NASPA member institutions (n=1,140) were surveyed using the Total Design Survey Method; a total of 821 responses were received. Focus was on four areas: general institutional information, student outcome program/plan, information sharing, and optional. Institutions were identified as a two-year college, four-year college, university, or graduate school. The study indicates that institutions are responding to the pressure for reform by implementing outcomes assessment programs. This trend does not vary by type or size of institution, and the differences between public and private institutions are minimal. It is in the category of developing plans that the largest difference is seen; over 50% of those institutions which are developing programs are public. The trend toward developing programs appears the strongest in those NASPA regions where members are from states with statewide initiatives. Still, almost two-thirds of the respondents reported no activity. Indications are that the interest and program activity level will dramatically increase over the next few years. Appended are the NASPA Research and Program Development Division 1987-88 Student Outcomes Assessment Survey Frequency of Responses with five tables, a list of institutions willing to share information on their outcomes assessment programs, and a region map. Contains 34 references. (SM)

ED303084

STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT SURVEY 1987-88

Presented at the Annual Meeting of the
Association for the Study of Higher Education
St. Louis, Missouri
November 4, 1988

Survey conducted by:
DUDLEY B. WOODARD, JR., UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
ALTON JAMISON, UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
MARK VON DESTINON, UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
RANDY HYMAN, SOUTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS
CENTRAL OFFICE/1700 18TH STREET, N.W., SUITE 301
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-2508
202-265-7500

HE 022 104

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ASHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ASHE
ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Adam's Mark Hotel in St. Louis, Missouri, November 3-6, 1988. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

NASPA Research and Program Development Division
1987-88 Student Outcomes Assessment Survey

The quality of undergraduate education and the assessment of the outcomes of the undergraduate experience are issues which have received increasing attention in legislative chambers, board rooms and other public forums across the nation. In recent years, several major reports have contributed to this national concern regarding improvements in the undergraduate experience.

Involvement in Learning (1984), a report of the Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education recommended a systematic program to assess the knowledge and skills developed by students in academic programs. To Reclaim a Legacy (1984), written by then Chair of the National Endowment for the Humanities, William Bennett, called for renewed attention to the humanities and urged higher education leaders to take a leading role in curricular reform. The Association of American College's report, Integrity in the College Curriculum (1985), noted an absence of accountability in higher education and proposed that college faculties design techniques for measuring student progress. The concerns these reports raised for members of the academy were articulated late in 1986 by Harvard University President, Derek Bok in his book Higher Learning. Bok focused on the quality of education and the failure of higher education to

assess the impacts of its teaching.

Accrediting bodies and state governing boards have also voiced concern. The Southern Regional Education Board's Commission for Educational Quality (1985) called for the establishment of a "new covenant" involving the public, its legislators, and educators to find ways to improve academic quality while maintaining student access. The Commission concluded this goal would require new measures of student performance. Also in 1985, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), a regional accrediting agency, adopted an accrediting standard of "institutional effectiveness." Institutions undergoing accreditation review by SACS are encouraged to undertake a range of student outcomes studies and to use the results to address deficiencies. Other regional accrediting agencies have stressed assessment within the context of existing standards and criteria. The North Central Association considers assessment within its criteria that "an institution is accomplishing its purposes" (Ewell, 1987b).

State bodies have also issued reports calling for action in public higher education (Colorado State General Assembly, 1985; Hollander, 1985; Illinois State Board of Higher Education, 1986; Mingle, 1986; Potter & McMillan, 1986; Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board, 1987). One notable report of 1986

is that of the National Governor's Association (NGA), A Time for Results. The NGA is organizing states with "mature" programs to coach other states in developing their programs (NGA, 1986).

The issues raised also have resulted in legislation requiring some form of assessment in public higher education; Tennessee, Colorado, New Jersey, and California are notable examples. In other states, legislators and governing bodies are issuing statements and resolutions urging the development of assessment programs. Today two-thirds of the states have programs in place (Boyer, et. al., 1987). Some states have gone beyond mandating or recommending assessment programs. Actions include revising funding formulas that reward institutions demonstrating gains in student learning (Ewell, 1985b; Floyd, 1982).

Although the national call for the improvement of the quality of education is clear--how to assess the undergraduate experience is not so clear! Many institutional efforts are underway but most institutions have developed their own standards making any peer comparison difficult.

In 1985 Hartle delineated six assessment activities in a paper prepared for the National Conference on Assessment in Higher Education:

- First, the use of multiple measures to track intellectual and personal growth over a period of time.
- Second are state mandated requirements to evaluate students and/or academic programs.
- The third use is to focus on the "value added" by post secondary education where students receive pre and post tests, and increases in knowledge and skills are measured. The change indicates the value added by the academic program.
- A fourth dimension refers to the use of standardized tests to examine general or specific knowledge.
- Fifth, assessment is seen as a way of making funding decisions by rewarding institutions for student performance on certain criteria. This effort emphasizes learning in general education, in the major field, and satisfaction with the education experience.
- Sixth, assessment may refer to student outcomes, measuring changes in student attitudes and values (Hartle, 1985).

Although institutions have used various methods to assess student achievement and growth and development, program quality in higher education has traditionally been based on institutional

resources or reputation. Reputational measures rely on the consensus of experts--faculty members, department chairs, deans, etc., to identify the highest quality programs. The information is often obtained through survey instruments. Reputational studies have been conducted at the undergraduate level (Astin & Solmon, 1981), the graduate level (Hughes, 1925, 1934; Keniston, 1959; Cartter, 1966; Roose & Anderson, 1970), and in professional schools (Blau & Margulies, 1973; Cartter & Solmon, 1977). Tan (1986) summarizes criticisms of reputational studies, yet he notes that reputational studies have been informative about programs at the doctoral level.

Astin (1985) and Tan (1986) have summarized the types of resources that have been used as indicators of quality including faculty, students, staff, physical facilities and expenditures. Astin notes the "symbiotic relationship" between the resource approach and the reputational method:

> That is, college faculties and administrators realize that recruiting more nationally visible faculty scholars and more National Merit Scholars and other highly able students will enhance the reputation of their institution. At the same time, an institution that can strengthen its reputation probably improves its ability to attract faculty members, students, and money. This close interplay between reputation and resources explains why measures based on the two conceptions are so strongly correlated (Astin, 1985, p. 43).

Earlier, Astin and Panos (1969) stated that there is evidence to support the notion that most outcomes measures depend far more on the quality of students admitted than on the quality of the program or institution. Even so, in the absence of better measures, student outcomes measures are used by many institutions to infer program quality.

Ewell (1985a) has reviewed the different types of student outcomes that can be measured. First, he distinguishes between cognitive gains and changes in attitude. Second, he distinguishes between changes occurring inside the student versus changes that can be observed. The final distinction made is between changes that occur while the student is in college versus changes that occur after college.

Institutional approaches range from those that emphasize periodic assessment of student goal attainment and job placement to those centered on cognitive gains achieved by students in different curricula to those that seek to measure the psychological development of students. Indeed, the definition of assessment continues to vary according to who uses the term for what purpose and in what political context (Ewell, 1987a, p.9).

This review of assessment illustrates the range of activities taking place and demonstrates the importance of precision in use of the word assessment. Many institutions have

taken advantage of the impetus provided by external bodies to design and implement assessment programs. Many of these have attempted to place assessment in the larger context of improvement in the quality of the educational experience rather than a singular emphasis on accountability. Some institutions have resisted outcomes assessment based on a concern for institutional autonomy and method of assessment. Many administrators, although favoring assessment, fear that responding to demands for external accountability may narrow the curriculum and compromise the quality and range of the undergraduate experience.

THE SURVEY

This national survey was conducted to determine the status of local campus initiatives. The goal was to determine: (1) if assessment programs have been developed or are being developed, (2) the objectives and source of initiation, and (3) assessment techniques. Of particular interest was the role student affairs played in local campus assessment initiatives. Were student development outcomes included in the plan? Did student affairs participate in designing the plan? What role did student affairs play in implementation?

To our knowledge this type of study has not been done before. Surveys have been completed regarding state initiatives (Boyer, et. al., 1987), and a recent survey by the American Council on

Higher Education (El-Khawas, 1987) focused on institutional assessment efforts. This study focused, however, on the role of student affairs in the development and implementation of assessment programs on campuses across the nation. The study was undertaken by the Research and Program Development Division of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

METHOD

All NASPA member institutions in the United States and Canada, a total of 1140, were surveyed using a pen and pencil instrument designed for ease of responses. The survey provided for check-off of specified responses with space for additional answers where necessary.

The Total Design Survey Method (Dillman, 1978) was used to solicit responses. This method provided for scheduled follow-up mailings after the initial request. A total of 821 responses were received. Additionally, there were 13 invalid responses received. The high degree of interest in this issue and the follow-up method combined to produce a remarkable response rate of 72%.

The survey form was divided into four areas: General Institutional Information, Student Outcome Program/Plan, Information Sharing, and Optional Section. The analysis is based on the responses of the 330 institutions who checked they had or were developing an outcomes assessment program contrasted to those

who indicated no action on assessment. It should be noted here that not every respondent replied to every question and that no analysis of the non respondents has been done. As with all studies relying on self reporting by the respondents, the results may be subject to variability due to interpretation.

DISCUSSION

Institutions were identified as a two year college, four year college, or university. As the responses were tallied it became necessary to include a fourth category, that of graduate school. The largest number of responses were from the four year colleges (40.9%), followed by universities (37%), and then by two year colleges (20.2%). There were not enough respondents in the fourth category, graduate schools, (only 15) to permit conclusions to be drawn. Responses by source of support (public/private) were equally distributed. Institution size was divided into 7 categories ranging from 1,000 to 30,000 students and both full time equivalency (FTE) and headcount were requested. Most respondents completed either the FTE or headcount category, but not both; therefore, the headcount for those institutions who reported only FTE was taken from the Fall 1987 enrollments reported to the 1988 Higher Education Directory.

There were some interesting variations based on region and size of institution. The largest response was from Regions II,

III, and IV-East and from institutions under 10,000 students. Therefore, results will reflect variations based on this clustering of responses.

The second section of the survey, titled Student Outcomes Program/Plan, asked respondents if their institution had a Student Outcomes Assessment program and, if they did not, were they in the process of developing one. The survey did not define assessment, permitting institutions to interpret it in their own way. Responses to the first and second questions were combined to provide Yes, No, and Developing categories. The majority of the respondents (59.8%) indicated that their institutions did not have, and were not developing, an assessment program. Nineteen percent of the respondents indicated their institutions were developing an assessment program. This is different from the survey results reported in Campus Trends 1987 where half of the institutions responding were developing assessment procedures (El-Khawas, 1987).

Respondents were requested to identify the office that initiated the outcomes assessment process, under what conditions the process was initiated, who developed the institution's assessment program, and who is responsible for assessing outcomes at each institution. There were 249 responses indicating that the initiative for outcomes assessment came from either the areas of

student affairs or academic affairs. Only 50 responses indicated that statewide boards were involved in the initiation process. This may reflect the large number of private institutions responding to the survey, yet it still is surprising when compared to the results of the survey performed by the Education Commission of the States (ECS) and the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE)in January-February of 1987. The ECS-AAHE survey found that two thirds of the states have outcomes assessment initiatives and "all but a few indicated they were playing important roles in assessment" (Boyer, et. al., 1987). This finding may merely indicate that student affairs and academic affairs are the areas of the institution where programs were initiated in response to the actions of statewide boards. Moreover, for those institutions who had an assessment plan, a surprising 49% of the respondents (74 institutions) indicated their assessment programs had been in operation longer than 3 years.

Accountability was listed most frequently as the condition under which the assessment process was initiated. Since the survey did not define accountability, leaving it for each respondent to interpret, the response may reflect the role of the statewide assessment initiatives. Campus committees, departments, or task forces were the answers identified most frequently as the

developers of the institution's outcomes assessment programs. The campus unit responsible for assessing outcomes was evenly distributed between student and academic affairs with a strong showing by institutional research.

The involvement of student affairs in the development process appears to be quite strong with 81.1% indicating participation. The role played by student affairs seems to be largely that of a committee member 131 responses yet nine institutions indicated that outcomes assessment was the primary responsibility of the student affairs area. The possibility of a reporting bias by student affairs officers arises here, although somewhat mitigated by an analysis of the respondents. The survey was sent only to NASPA institutional members, thus student affairs officers. It is interesting to note that 172 of the returned surveys were completed by either institutional research or academic affairs offices.

The third section of the survey was titled Information Sharing and asked respondents to send copies of their assessment programs and annual reports. Those who indicated they were willing to share information on their institution's programs were asked to provide the name and address of a contact person. Last, respondents were asked if they would like to receive a copy of the

survey results. An over whelming 602 respondents, 73.3% of the total, have so requested.

There were only 206 institutions who responded to the request for detailed information in the Optional Section. This number is greater than the number of institutions who said they had assessment plans in operation. It was interesting to review the types of data collected, when they are collected, and what comparisons are intended to be made with them. It is not surprising to see that most data were collected at entry/orientation, in the senior year, and after graduation since those traditionally have been common data collection points prior to the recent interest in assessment.

After reviewing general frequency responses, cross tabulations were performed in an attempt to see if the assessment plan varied by institutional characteristics. A breakdown of the response to the first question, "Does your institution have an assessment plan?", by NASPA Region is provided in Table 1. Two regions stand out as having the largest number of assessment plans in operation. They are Region II, composed of New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, New Jersey, Delaware, and the District of Columbia, and Region III, composed of the southern states.

A further breakdown of the response by region is provided in Table 2 where those institutions developing programs are separated

out of the no answers. Again we see that Regions II and III show activity, yet Region IV- West, primarily the plains states, and Region V, the northwest, have begun to develop programs as well. Analysis of the activity in the regions can be related to developments in the states. The impact of the guidelines adopted by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), a regional accrediting agency, can be seen in Region III. In addition, five of the states in that region have addressed assessment on a statewide level. The states in a region who either have, or are undertaking, statewide assessment initiatives may be noted as a possible causal factor in the activity seen in Table 2.

Having examined the response by region, the institution's classification was next compared to the assessment plan to determine if the existence or development of assessment plans varied by type of institution. This comparison can be seen in Table 3 where no major differences are noted. The existence of assessment plans and the activity towards developing plans is shown to be remarkably similar across all types of institutions.

Table 4 examines the distribution of responses between the Public and Private institutions. The public institutions have only a slight lead over private institutions with established plans. The two types of institutions are almost evenly balanced

in not having plans. It is in the developing plans area that a difference appears with 56.6% of the public institutions showing action. This, again, possibly reflects the influence of statewide initiatives on public institutions.

Table 5 presents institution size, based on the fall 1987 headcount, compared to the existence of an assessment plan. Minimal differences were noted among the groups except for institutions from 5,000-9,999 students and those over 30,000 students. Those two categories show more activity in the area of developing plans than do institutions of other sizes, however the difference is not large. The small number of respondents from institutions over 30,000 makes interpretation difficult.

SUMMARY

In general, institutions are responding to the pressure for reform by implementing outcomes assessment programs. This trend does not vary by type or size of institution, and the differences between public and private institutions are minimal. It is in the category of developing plans that the largest difference is seen; over 50% of those institutions who are developing programs are public.

The trend towards developing programs appears the strongest in those regions of NASPA whose members are from states with statewide initiatives. In spite of this trend towards outcomes

assessment, it must be noted that nearly two-thirds of the respondents reported no activity. However, if the response to the ECS-AAHE and Campus Trends reports and the activity noted in this report are accurate, the interest and program activity level will dramatically increase over the next few years. The Research and Program Development Division will continue to monitor this trend and report findings to the membership.

References

Association of American Colleges. (1985). Integrity in the College Curriculum. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges.

Astin, A.W. (1985). Achieving Educational Excellence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A.W. & Panos, R.J. (1969). The Educational and Vocational Development of College Students. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Astin, A.W. & Solmon, L.C. (1981). Are reputational ratings needed to measure quality. Change, 13 (October), 14-19.

Bennett, William J. (1984). To Reclaim a Legacy: A Report on the Humanities in Higher Education. Washington, D.C. : National Endowment for the Humanities.

Blau, P.M. & Margulies, R.Z. (1974). The Reputations of American Professional Schools. Change, 6, (Winter), 42-47.

Bok, D. (1986). Higher Education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Boyer, C., Ewell, P., Findley, J. and Mingle, J. (1987). Assessment and Outcomes Measurement: A View from the States. AAHE Bulletin, 39(7), 8-12.

Cartter, A.M. (1966). An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education. Washington, D.C.: The American Council on Education.

Cartter, A.M. & Solmon, L.C. (1977). The Cartter report on the leading schools of education, law, and business. Change, 9, 44-48.

Colorado State General Assembly. (1985). An Act: House Bill No. 1187. Denver, CO: State House.

Dillman, D. (1978). Mail and Telephone Surveys. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1978.

El-Khawas, E. (1987). Colleges Reclaim the Assessment Initiative. Educational Record. Spring, 54-58.

Ewell, P.T. (1985a). Editor's Notes. In P.T. Ewell (ed.). Assessing Educational Outcomes. New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 47, September.

Ewell, P.T. (1985b). Levers for Change: The Role of State Government in Improving the Quality of Postsecondary Education. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.

Ewell, P.T. (1987a). Establishing a Campus Based Assessment Program. in D.F. Halpern (ed.). Student Outcomes Assessment: What institutions Stand to Gain. New Directions for Higher Education, no. 59. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Fall.

Ewell, P.T. (1987b) Assessment: Where are we? Change. January -February. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Higher Education.

Floyd, Carol E. (1982). State Planning, Budgeting, and Accountability: Approaches for Higher Education. AAHE-ERIC Education Research Report No. 6. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Hartle, Terry W. (1985). The Growing Interest in Measuring the Educational Achievements of College Students. Assessment in Higher Education: Issues and Contexts. Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Gov. Printing Office.

Hollander, T. Edward. (1985). College Outcomes Evaluation Program. Trenton, NJ: New Jersey State Department of Higher Education.

Hughes, R.M. (1925). A Study of Graduate Schools of America. Oxford, Ohio: The Miami University Press.

Hughes, R.M. (1934). Report of the committee on graduate instruction. Educational Record, 15, 192-234.

Illinois State Board of Higher Education. (1986). Undergraduate Education: Report of the Committee on the Study of Undergraduate Education. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Higher Education.

Keniston, H. (1959). Graduate Study in Research in the Arts and Sciences at the University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press.

Mingle, James R. (1986). Assessment and the Variety of its Forms: A Report Prepared for the Task Force on Planning and Quality Assessment of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education. State Higher Education Executive Officers Association.

National Governor's Association Task Force. (1986). A Time for Results. Washington, D.C: National Governor's Association.

Potter, David L. and McMillan, James H. (1986). The Measurement of Student Achievement and the Assurance of Quality in Virginia Higher Education: Report of A study conducted by the General Assembly of Virginia. Senate Document No. 14. Richmond, VA: Virginia State General Assembly Senate.

Roose, K.D. & Anderson, C.J. (1970). A Rating of Graduate Programs. Washington, D.C.: The American Council on Education.

Solmon, L.C. (1975). The definition of college quality and its impact on earnings. Explorations in Economic Research, Fall.

Southern Regional Education Board Commission for Educational Quality. (1985). Access to Quality Undergraduate

Education. Reprinted in The Chronicle of Higher Education, July 3, 9-12.

Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education. (1984). Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Tan, D. (1986). The assessment of quality in higher education: A Critical review of the literature and research. Research in Higher Education. 24(3), 223-265.

Torregrossa, C. (Ed). (1988). Higher Education Directory. Washington, D.C.: Higher Education Publications.

Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board. (1987). The Statewide Master Plan, Issue Area: Quality, Question No. 4, Performance Evaluation. Olympia, WA: Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board.

NASPA Research and Program Development Division
1987-88 Student Outcomes Assessment Survey Frequency of Responses

General Institutional Information

1. Response by Region of NASPA

Region 1	78	(9.5%)
Region 2	157	(19.1%)
Region 3	181	(22.%)
Region 4-East	68	(20.5%)
Region 4-West	106	(12.9%)
Region 5	64	(7.8%)
Region 6	67	(8.2%)
Total	821	

2. Response by Classification of Institution

2 year college	166	(20.2%)
4 Year College	336	(40.9%)
University	304	(37.%)
Graduate School	15	(1.8%)
	821	

3. Response by source of support

Public Institution	431	(52.5%)
Private Institution	390	(47.5%)
	821	

4. Responses by Size of Institution

Headcount		
under 1,000	134	(16.3%)
1,000-2,499	227	(27.6%)
2,500-4,999	150	(18.3%)
5,000-9,999	141	(17.2%)
10,000-19,999	98	(11.9)
20,000-30,000	45	(5.5%)
over 30,000	26	(3.2%)
	821	

Section II. Student Outcome Program/Plan

1. Does your institution have a student outcomes assessment program?
   Yes- 174 (21.2%) No- 491 (59.8%) Developing- 156 (19%)

2. How long has your assessment plan been in operation?
   1 Year- 36 (23.8%) 2 Years- 22 (14.6%) 3 Years- 19 (12.6%)
   Over 3 Years- 74 (49%) No Response- 670
   (Percentages based on actual responses)

3. Who initiated the outcomes assessment process at your institution?

Trustees/Board	27
Academic Affairs	136
Legislature	31
Students	6
President	77
Student Affairs	113
Faculty	33
Business Affairs	2
Statewide Board	50
Regional Accreditation	10
Governor	2
Campus Committee	5
Grant	2
Other	8

(Totals and percentages not provided as responses permitted in more than one category)

4. Under what conditions was the assessment process initiated?

Financial Exigency	6
Curricular Reform	71
Accountability	172
Academic Reorganize	29
Regional Accreditation	21
Retention	4
General Interest	5
Statewide Board	3
Planning	5
Grant	2
Other	9

(Totals and percentages not provided as responses permitted in more than one category)

5. Who developed your institution's outcomes assessment program?

Campus Committee	87
Campus Task Force	82
Campus Department	64
Consultant	15
Statewide Board	9
Alumni	2
External Body	2
ACT	2

(Totals and percentages not provided as responses permitted in more than one category)

6. Who is responsible for assessing student outcomes on your campus?

Institutional Research	116
Student Affairs	152
Academic Affairs	162
University Wide Comm.	43
College/Departments	74
Statewide Board	2
Alumni	2
Other	6

(Totals and percentages not provided as responses permitted in more than one category)

7. Was Student Affairs involved in the development process?

Yes- 223 (81.1%) No- 52 (18.9%) No Response- 546

8. In what way was Student Affairs involved?

Advisory Capacity	76
Committee Member	131
Primary Responsibility	9
Other	7

(Totals and percentages not provided as responses permitted in more than one category)

9. Is there a Committee or Office responsible for coordinating your institution's outcomes assessment program?

Yes- 183 (67.%) No- 90 (33.%) No Response- 548

Section III. Information Sharing

Will you send a copy of your outcomes assessment implementation plan?

Yes- 55 No- 17 Not Available- 322 No Response- 427

Will you send a copy of your most recent annual outcomes assessment report?

Yes- 32 No- 28 Not Available- 298 No Response- 463

A list of institutions willing to share information is provided.

Optional Section

There were 206 schools who responded on the optional section. A frequency count of the responses is provided.

1. Does your plan assess:

General Education Outcomes	112
Major/Specialization Outcomes	87
Student Development Outcomes	82

2. What measures are used in your program? (Respondents were asked to check more than one).

ACT	55
SAT	43
ACT COMP	45
GRE	34
CIRP	33
CSEQ	12
Student Project/Portfolio	27
Student Documents/Records	56
Entering Student Survey	53
Employer Survey	37
Continuing Student Survey	52
Alumni Survey	81
Withdrawing Student Survey	70
Student Observation	25
Student Interviews	47
Statewide Exam	3
Institutional Exam	10
ETS	7
Other	20

3. Which of the methods/measures are used to collect pre and post data? (Respondents were asked to check more than one).

ACT	41
SAT	25
ACT COMP	36
GRE	12
CIRP	18
CSEQ	5
Student Project/Portfolio	8
Student Documents/Records	30
Entering Student Survey	29
Employer Survey	18
Continuing Student Survey	30
Alumni Survey	36
Withdrawing Student Survey	33
Student Observation	11
Student Interviews	26
Institutional Exam	5
ETS	1
Other	12

4. At what points are the data collected? (Respondents were asked to check more than one).

Entry/Orientation	100
Freshman Year	68
Sophomore Year	60
Junior Year	44
Senior Year	75
At Graduation	51
After Graduation	73

5. What kinds of comparisons are expected with the data? (Respondents were asked to check more than one).

Institution Only	103
Peer Institutions	54
Statewide Comparisons	34
National Comparisons	52
Other	2

Table 1

Cross Tabulation of Assessment Plan by Region of NASPA

PLAN	REGION Region I	Region II	Region III	Region IV-East	Region IV-West	Region V	Region VI	ROW TOTAL
Has Plan	10	45	55	25	23	4	12	174
	r=5.7	r=25.9	r=31.6	r=14.4	r=13.2	r=2.3	r=6.9	r=21.2
	c=12.8	c=28.7	c=30.4	c=14.8	c=21.7	c=6.3	c=17.9	
No Plan	68	112	126	143	83	60	55	647
	r=10.5	r=17.3	r=19.5	r=22.1	r=12.8	r=9.3	r=8.5	r=78.8
	c=87.2	c=71.3	c=69.6	c=85.2	c=78.3	c=93.7	c=82.1	
COLUMN TOTAL	78	157	181	168	106	64	67	821
	9.5	19.1	22.	20.5	12.9	7.8	8.2	100.

Region II and Region III show the largest number of assessment plans in operation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

Cross Tabulation of Assessment Plan by Region of NASPA

PLAN	REGION Region I	Region II	Region III	Region IV-	Region IV-	Region V	ROW Region VI	TOTAL
Has Plan	10 r=5.7 c=12.8	45 r=28.4 c=28.7	55 r=31.6 c=30.4	25 r=14.4 c=14.9	23 r=13.2 c=21.7	4 r=2.3 c=6.3	12 r=6.9 c=17.9	174 r=21.2
No Plan	64 r=12.7 c=82.1	78 r=15.5 c=49.6	87 r=17.3 c=48.1	122 r=24.3 c=72.6	58 r=11.6 c=54.7	46 r=9.2 c=71.9	47 r=9.4 c=70.2	502 r=61.2
Developing Plan	4 r=2.8 c=5.1	34 r=23.4 c=21.7	39 r=26.9 c=21.5	21 r=14.5 c=12.5	25 r=17.2 c=23.6	14 r=9.7 c=21.8	8 r=5.5 c=11.9	145 r=17.6
COLUMN TOTAL	78 9.5	157 19.1	181 22.	168 20.5	106 12.9	64 7.8	67 8.2	821 100.

Developing Plan totals reduce the number of No Plan responses.
Region II and Region III show the most number of assessment plans in operation.
Regions II, III, IV-West and V show activity towards developing assessment programs.

Table 3

Cross Tabulation of Assessment Plan By Classification

PLAN	CLASSIFICATION: 2 Year College	4 Year College	University	Graduate School	ROW TOTAL
Has Plan	36	71	64	3	174
	r=20.7	r=40.8	r=36.8	r=1.7	r=21.5
	c=21.8	c=21.7	c=21.3	c=2.	
No Plan	100	197	182	10	489
	r=20.4	r=40.3	r=37.2	r=2.	r=60.5
	c=60.6	c=60.3	c=60.4	c=6.67	
Developing Plan	29	59	55	2	145
	r=20.	r=40.7	r=37.9	r=1.4	r=17.9
	c=17.6	c=18.	c=18.3	c=1.33	
COLUMN TOTAL	165	327	301	15	808
	20.4	40.5	37.3	1.9	100.

(Number of Missing Observations = 13)

Assessment activities similar across all types of institutions.

Table 4

Cross Tabulation of Assessment Plan By Source of Support

PLAN	SOURCE OF SUPPORT: Public Institution	SOURCE OF SUPPORT: Private Institution	ROW TOTAL
Has Plan	98	76	174
	r=56.3	r=43.7	r=21.5
	c=23.	c=19.9	
No Plan	246	243	489
	r=50.3	r=49.7	r=60.5
	c=57.8	c=63.6	
Developing Plan	82	63	145
	r=56.6	r=43.4	r=17.9
	c=19.2	c=16.5	
COLUMN TOTAL	426	382	808
	52.7	47.3	100.

(Number of Missing Observations = 13)

Public institutions show more activity developing plans than private.

Table 5

Cross Tabulation of Assessment Plan by Institution Size (Fall 1987 Headcount)

PLAN	SIZE Under 1,000	1,000-2,499	2,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000-30,000	Over 30,000	ROW TOTAL
Has Plan	25	48	31	34	21	9	6	174
	r=14.4	r=27.6	r=17.8	r=19.5	r=12.1	r=5.2	r=3.4	r=21.7
	c=18.9	c=21.4	c=21.2	c=24.5	c=21.6	c=20.	c=24.	
No Plan	86	138	92	69	64	27	13	489
	r=17.6	r=28.2	r=18.8	r=14.1	r=13.1	r=5.5	r=2.7	r=60.5
	c=65.2	c=61.6	c=63.	c=49.6	c=6.6	c=60.	c=52.	
Developing Plan	21	38	23	36	12	9	6	145
	r=14.5	r=26.2	r=15.9	r=24.8	r=8.3	r=6.2	r=4.1	r=17.9
	c=15.9	c=17.	c=15.8	c=25.9	c=12.4	c=20.	c=24.	
COLUMN TOTAL	132	224	146	139	97	45	25	808
	16.3	27.7	18.1	17.2	12.	5.6	3.1	100.

(Number of Missing Observations = 13)

No differences by institution size except in developing plan for 5,000-9,999 and Over 30,000.

INSTITUTIONS WILLING TO SHARE INFORMATION
ON THEIR OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PROGRAMS

Dr. Albert J. Sloan
Dean of Students
Miles College
Birmingham, AL 35064

C. Pettigram
V.P. Student Services
Tuskegee University
Tuskegee, AL 36088

Betty Asher
V.P. Student Affairs
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287

Doug Woodard
V.P. Student Affairs
University of Arizona
Admin. Bldg. - 401
Tucson, AZ 85721-0664
(602) 621-3772

Kristine Dillion
Asst. V.P.
Univ. Southern CA
STU 201
Los Angeles, CA 90089

Frank Gornick
Dean of Students
Bakersfield College
1801 Oanorama Dr.
Bakersfield, CA 93305

Colorado State Univ.
Fort Collins, CO 80523
(303) 491-5693

Arlene Virgil
Vice President
Front Range Comm.
Westminster, CO 80030
(303) 466-8811

Diane Unger
Adm. Officer
S.E. Col. Osteopath
1750 N.E. 168 St.
N. Miami Beach, Fl 33162

George W. Young
V.P. Student Affairs
Broward Comm. Col.
225 E. Los Olas Blvd.
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301

Dr. Harry E. Payne
Dean of Students
Florida College
Tampa, FL 33617

Eugene Hallogren
Assoc. Dean Acad. Affairs
College of DuPage, 22nd St. Lambert Rd.
Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

William Thomas
V.C. Student Affairs
UofMD College Park
2108 N. Admin. Bldg.
College Park, MD 20742

Cynthia Greco
Dean of Students
Loyola College
4501 N. Charles St.
Baltimore, MD 21210

Bernard Brown
V.P. Student Affairs
Worcester Institute
100 Institute Road
Worcester, MA 01609

Van D. Quick
V.P. Studnet Personnl
Mississippi College
P.O Box #4007
Clinton, MS 39056

Ginny Booker
Asst. Vice Chancellor of Student
Univ. of Mo. at Columbia
211 Jesse Hall
Columbia, MO 65211

Thomas R. Lease
V.P. Student Affairs
Avila College
11901 Wornall Road
Kansas City, MO 64145

Sandy McLean
V.C Student Affairs
Univ. MS - St. Louis
St. Louis, MO 63121

Asst. V.C. Students
Univ NE - Omaha
Omaha, NE 68182

David Elderkin
Hesser College
25 Lowell St.
Manchester, NH 03101

Janice Murray
Dean of Students
Kean College
Morris Avenue
Union, NJ 07083
(201) 527-2190

Wynn Phillips
Dean, Student Affairs
Union County College
Crawford, NJ 07016

Thomas Eakin
Penn State University
211 Eisenhower
McKeesport, PA 15132
(814) 863-4926

Dr. Judith Thomas
Professor of Education
Philadelphia College of Text Sci.
Schoolhouse Lane + Henry Ave.
Philadelphia, PA 19144

David Scarborough
Dean of Students
Washington Jefferson
Washington, PA 15301

Thomas R. Dougan
Asst. V.P. Campus Life
University Rhode Island
Kingston, RI 02881

Karen Haskell
Dean of Students
Roger William College
Bristol, RI 02809

Bud Donohue
V.P. Student Life
Univ. South Dakota
Vermillion, SD 57069

Dean of Student Affairs
Dakota State College
Madison, SD 57042

Kris Smith
South Dakota St. U.
Admin. 315
Brookings, SD 57007
(605) 688-4493

Dr. Glenn Bettis
Asst. V.P. Acad. Affairs
E. Tenn State Univ.
P.O. Box 24490 A
Johnson City, Tenn 37614

Donald Carson
V.P. Student Services
Memphis State Univ.
Memphis, TN 38152

D. Grandberry
Tenn. State University
Nashville, Tenn. 37203

Tom Walter
Director, Cnsig
Reinhardt College
Waleska, GA 30183

William Daehling
Vice President
Lewis Clark St. Col.
Lewiston, ID 83501

Josep Palladino
Univ. Southern IN
8600 Univ. Blvd.
Evansville, IN 47712

Dr. Jack Sander
Indiana St. Univ.
Student Services A4
217 N. 6th Street
Terre Haute, IN 47809
(812) 237-3845

Daryl Hersemann
Valparaiso Univ.
Valparaiso, IN 36383

Jeannette Lester
St. Mary's College
Notre Dame, IN 46556

Dr. Gerald Jorgensen
V.P. Student Dev.
Loras College
Dubuque, IA 52001

Mervin Buzzard
Haskell Indiana Jr.
23rd Baker Ave.
Lawrence, KS 66046

Dan P. Vandewinkle
Dean of Students
Ft. Scott Comm. Col.
2108 South Horton
Ft. Scott, KS 66701

Craig A. Clagett
Prince George's Com.
Largo, MD 20772

Tina Taylor
Santa Fe Comm.
P.O. Box 4187
Santa Fe, NM 87502

Wayne Cares
V.P. Studnet Affairs
Eastern NM Univ.
Portales, NM 88130

Michael Cooper
Dean of Students
Clarkston Univ.
Potsdam, NY 13676
(315) 268-6620

Robert Goldschmidt
Dean
Touro College
30 W. 44 Street
New York, NY 10036
(212) 221-2296

Nancy Thompson
SUNY A&T Farmingdale
Farmingdale, NY 11735
(516) 589-7389

James Lancaster
Dean of Students
Univ. NC Greensburo
155 Ellion Ctr.
Greensboro, NC 27412

Michael Riemann
V.P. Academic Affairs
Pfeifer College
Misenheimer, NC 28109

Meg Benne
Asst. Dean of Students
Ohio Univ. Athens
212 Culver
Athens, OH 45701

James Bowser
V.P. Student Services
Hocking Tech. Col.
Rt. #1
Nelsonville, OH 45764

George Dupey
Tiffin University
155 Miami Street
Tiffin, OH 44883

Anthony Deconcilius
V.P. Student Affairs
King's College
Wilkes-Barre, PA 18711
(717) 826-5878

Howard Benoist
Our Lady of the Lake Univ.
San Antonio, TX 78285

Dr. Gerard Dizinno
Dir., Outcomes Assessment
St. Mary's Iniversity
San Antonio, TX 78284

Dr. Mary Hill
Dean of Students
West TX State Univ.
Canyon, TX 79016
(806) 656-2049

David E. Buckingham
Dean of Students
Virginia Wesleyan Col.
Norfolk VA 23502

Steven Culver
Radford University
Radford, VA 24141
(703) 831-5819

L. Low
Univ. of Virginia
Cinch Valley Wise, VA
24293
(703) 328-0183

William Moore
Student Dev. Ed.
Longwood College
Farmville, VA 23901
(804) 392-9261

R. Wilson
V.P. Student Affairs
VA Commonworth Univ.
Richard, VA 23284

Dr. Grant Smith
V.P. Undergrad Pg.
Eastern WA Univ.
Academic Affairs #132
Cheney, WA 99004

Patricia Woehrlin
Asst. V.P. Student Affairs
Univ. Washington
472 Schmitz Hall
Seattle, WA 98195

REGION MAP

From: NASPA 1987 Membership Directory

32

OPTIONAL SECTION: Program Specific

We would appreciate your completing this optional section, but not at the expense of a timely response to the survey

1. Does your plan assess: (may check more than one)
   General Education Outcomes ___
   Major/Specialization Outcomes ___
   Student Development Outcomes ___

2. What measures are used in your program? (may check more than one)
   ACT __ SAT __ ACT COMP __ GRE __ CIRP __ CSEQ __
   Student Projects/Portfolios __ Student Documents/Records __
   Locally Developed Entering Student Survey __ Employer Survey __
   Locally Developed Continuing Student Survey __ Alumni Survey __
   Withdrawing Student Survey __ Student Observation __
   Student Interviews __ Other: (please specify)
   _____
   _____

3. Which of the methods/measures are used to collect pre and post test data? (may check more than one)
   ACT __ SAT __ ACT COMP __ GRE __ CIRP __ CSEQ __
   Student Projects/Portfolios __ Student Documents/Records __
   Locally Developed Entering Student Survey __ Employer Survey __
   Locally Developed Continuing Student Survey __ Alumni Survey __
   Withdrawing Student Survey __ Student Observation __
   Student Interviews __ Other: (please specify)
   _____
   _____

4. At what points are the data collected? (may check more than one)
   Entry/Orientation __ Freshman Year __ Sophomore Year __ Junior Year __
   Senior Year __ At Graduation __ Following Graduation __

5. What kinds of comparisons are expected with the data?
   Institution Only __ Peer Institutions __ Statewide Comparisons __
   National Comparisons __ Other (please specify) _____

NASPA RESEARCH AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

1987 Student Outcomes Assessment Survey

I. General Institutional Information

1. Name of Respondent: _____

   Title: _____

   Address: _____

   Telephone Number: _____

2. NASPA Region: I ____ II ____ III ____ IV-East ____ IV-West ____
   V ____ VI ____

3. Classification: 2-year College ____ 4-year College ____ University ____

4. Source of Support: Public ____ Private ____

5. Size of Institution: Total Enrollment Fall 1987:

FTE Count		Headcount Full & Part Time	
Under 1,000	____	Under 1,000	____
1,000-2,499	____	1,000-2,499	____
2,500-4,999	____	2,500-4,999	____
5,000-9,999	____	5,000-9,999	____
10,000-19,999	____	10,000-19,999	____
20,000-30,000	____	20,000-30,000	____
Over 30,000	____	Over 30,000	____

II. Student Outcome Program/Plan

1. Does your institution have a student outcomes assessment program?
   Yes __ No __

2. If NO, has a student outcomes assessment plan been developed for your institution ? Yes __ No __

3. If YES to Question 2, what is the anticipated implementation date?
   _____

4. If a plan is already in operation, how long has it been in use?
   1 year __ 2 years __ 3 years __ Longer __

5. Who initiated the outcomes assessment process? (may check more than one)
   Trustees/Board __ Academic Affairs __ Legislature __ Students __
   President __ Student Affairs __ Faculty __ Business Affairs __
   Statewide Board __ Other (Please Specify) _____

6. Under what conditions was the process initiated?
   Financial Exigency __ Curricular Reform __ Accountability __
   Academic Reorganization __ Other (please specify) _____

7. Who developed your institution's outcomes assessment program?
   Campus Committee __ Campus Task Force __ Campus Agency/Department __
   Consultant __ External Body (please define) _____
8. Who is responsible for assessing student outcomes on your campus?
   (check all that apply) Institutional Research __ Student Affairs __
   Academic Affairs __ University Wide Committee __ College/Departments __
   Other (please specify) _____
9. Was Student Affairs involved in the development process? Yes __ No __
10. If YES to Question 9, in what way? Advisory Capacity __
    Committee/Task Force Member __ Other (please specify) _____
11. Is there a committee or office responsible for coordinating your institution's outcomes assessment program/plan? Yes __ No __
12. If yes, please identify the chair or coordinator (name,address,phone)

_____

_____

_____

III. Information Sharing

1. Will you send us a copy of your outcomes assessment implementation plan? Yes __ No __ Not Available __
2. Will you send us a copy of your most recent annual outcomes assessment report? Yes __ No __ Not Available __
3. If several institutions share their implementation plans and annual reports a brief summary will be presented at the annual conference in St. Louis next spring. If you would like your institution to be listed on a reference handout at the conference please indicate. Yes __ No __
4. If YES, who should be listed as the contact person? (name,address,phone)

_____

_____

_____

5. Would you like to receive a copy of the survey results? Yes __ No __

Please return surveys and address all inquiries to:
NASPA Research & Program Development Division
Administration Building, Room 401
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona 85721-0664
(602) 621-3772